

1
2
3
4
5
6 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
7 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
8 AT SEATTLE

9 RLI INSURANCE COMPANY a/s/o
10 AMERIMARK DIRECT, LLC, AND
AMERIMARK DIRECT LLC,

11 Plaintiffs,

12 v.

13 EXPEDITORS INTERNATIONAL OF
14 WASHINGTON, INC., d/b/a EXPEDITORS
15 INTERNATIONAL OCEAN,

16 Defendant.

IN ADMIRALTY AND AT LAW

CASE NO. C18-204 RSM

ORDER ON PLAINTIFFS' SECOND
MOTION TO EXTEND TIME TO REOPEN
CASE OR ALTERNATIVELY TO REOPEN
THE CASE

17 This matter is before the Court on Plaintiffs' Second Motion to Extend Time to
18 Reopen Case or Alternatively to Reopen the Case. Dkt. #43. Defendant informed the Court,
19 on January 7, 2019, that "the parties have reached an agreement in principle" on a settlement.
20 Dkt. #37. As a result, the Court entered a Dismissal Order on February 20, 2019, and
21 permitted the parties to "move to reopen the case . . . within thirty (30) days" if settlement
22 was not perfected. Dkt. #38.
23

24 On March 22, 2019, Plaintiffs filed a motion to extend the time to reopen the case
25 for thirty days because the "reported settlement in the matter has not yet been perfected"
26 and "Plaintiffs believe that the parties will perfect the reported settlement in the matter in
27

1 the near future.” Dkt. #39. The Court granted that motion on April 15, 2019. Dkt. #42. On
2 April 19, 2019, Plaintiffs filed this Motion to extend the time to reopen the case for an
3 additional thirty days for the same reasons and filed a third motion for an additional 30 days
4 on May 20, 2019. Dkts. #43 and #45. The parties indicate gradual progress towards
5 finalizing settlement and indicate that the third extension is necessary because “[t]he parties
6 remain working on exchanging the executed closing documents and receiving and clearing
7 the settlement funds in the matter.” Dkt. #46 at ¶ 3.

8
9 The Court appreciates that the parties have settled and finds good cause to permit the
10 parties to finalize that settlement. But the Court’s repeated consideration of motions for 30-
11 day extensions is not a good use of judicial resources. The Court will extend the time to
12 reopen the case to a date certain and informs the parties that it is unlikely to grant further
13 extensions without greater justification.

14 Accordingly, having considered the Motion, supporting documents, and the
15 remainder of the record, the Court finds and ORDERS:
16

- 17 1. Good cause exists for an extension of the Court’s deadline for any party to move to
18 reopen the case and Plaintiffs’ Second Motion to Extend Time to Reopen Case or
19 Alternatively to Reopen the Case (Dkt. #43) is GRANTED. The Court extends the
20 deadline through June 28, 2019.

21 //

22 //

23 //

24 //

25 //

26 //

1 2. Plaintiffs' Third Motion to Extend Time to Reopen Case or Alternatively to Reopen
2 the Case (Dkt. #45) is DENIED as moot.

3 Dated this 22nd day of May 2019.

4
5 

6 RICARDO S. MARTINEZ
7 CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27